

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/003,041 | 11/01/2001 | Charles G. Williamson | 09741620-0204 | 1233 |
| | 7590 02/08/200 CIN NATH & ROSEN | EXAMINER | | |
| P.O. BOX 0610 | | PEYTON, TAMMARA R | | |
| WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2182 | |
| | | , | | |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY | PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS 02/08/200 | | 02/08/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| Office Action Summary | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | . 10/003,041 | WILLIAMSON, CHARLES G. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Tammara R Peyton | 2182 | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 N | lovember 2006 . | | | | |
| 2a)□ | <u> </u> | s action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ | Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-20 is/are pending in the ap | plication. | • | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7,9,18 and 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 10-20</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) 🗌 | 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | | |
| • | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. | | | | | | |
| 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 2) 🔲 Notic | ee of References Cited (PTO-892) ee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) Notice of Informal F | (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |

Office Action Summary

Application/Control Number: 10/003,041

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Allowed claims 1-6, 10-17, and 20-22 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-17 of U. S. Patent No. 7,133,739 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent. The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: "a code input device; a controller that stores a plurality of recipe programs upon receipt of the plurality of programs at the network interface or the user interface and operates the microwave generator in accordance with a recipe

Application/Control Number: 10/003,041

Art Unit: 2182

program selected from the plurality of recipe programs in view of a code input by the code input device; a network interface in communication with the controller, and a user interface to permit a user to manually input a user programmed recipe programs; wherein upon entry of a code input by the code input device, the controller determines whether the code corresponds to any one of the plurality of recipe programs stored in the controller; and wherein if the code does not correspond to any one of the plurality of recipe programs stored in the controller, the network interface requests, without user intervention, a recipe program corresponding to the code from an external database, and automatically downloads the recipe program that corresponds to the code.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammara Peyton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4157. The examiner can normally be reached between 6:30 - 4:00 from Monday to Thursday, (I am off every first Friday), and 6:30-3:00 every second Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization

Application/Control Number: 10/003,041

Art Unit: 2182

where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Mailed responses to this action should be sent to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231.

Faxes for Official/formal (After Final) communications or for informal or draft communications (please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT") sent to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

USTPO, Randolph Building, Customer Service Window

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

TAMMARA PEYTON PRIMARY EXAMINED

Tammara Peyton

February 2, 2007